There are important choices that need to be made at the outset: First, does one predetermine the content of training, or wait to see where the demand is? It is recommended that some modules be developed at the outset, with subsequent module development driven by demand.

A second question is whether modules should be broken down by sector (e.g. modules on food, education, and/or development), or by population (e.g. modules on children, women and displaced persons). Both approaches have their merits, but the population-oriented modules are recommended here because of the greater levels of existing resources in the community for specific populations. A main aim of this initiative is to promote the cross-fertilization of expertise and ideas. For both the child-focussed and displaced-focussed module, one objective should be to demonstrate how rights based programming can improve aid services to those populations.

Considerable expertise already exists in the community on each of the proposed subjects. It is recommended, therefore, that modules are designed and offered in coordination with relevant partners for each subject area.

The following table suggests recommends content, objectives, and methodology for some subject-specific modules.

PHASE TWO: SUBJECT-SPECIFIC MODULES	
Content	**Objective & Methodology**
Module 1: Rights and Rights Based Programming Focussing on Children	
Overview of Child Rights, and RBP focussing on Children.	❑ Use interactive workshops to orient pax on the rights of children, in the CRC, the IBR and other documents. ❑ By using case-studies, work with pax to demonstrate how RBP can improve aid services to children
Module 2: Rights and Rights Based Programming for Displaced Persons	
Overview of rights protecting refugees and IDPs and RBP focussing on the displaced	❑ Use interactive presentation to orient pax on the rights of displaced persons in e.g. CSR and the GDIP ❑ Provide case studies to work through how RBP can improve aid services to refugees
Module 3: Human Rights Fact-finding Documentation, and Report Writing	
Basic Training in How to Interview/ Fact-find, & Document/Write up Human Rights reports	❑ By laying out guiding principles, and using case-studies and role plays, help pax develop reporting skills. ❑ Provide check-lists, templates, examples etc. as resources
Module 4: Advocacy, lobbying and networking strategies	
Basic Training on Raising Human Rights Awareness with Other Constituencies	❑ Lay out various strategies for witnessing and advocacy, taking into account costs & benefits of each. ❑ By using case studies, get pax to use different strategies in different contexts, and refine their awareness of each

Phase Three: Developing Rights Based Programming Skills Among Aid Actors

Once there is a sufficient level of buy-in into the ideas behind rights-based programming, the challenge will be to help aid actors refine their decision-making in concrete ways based on RBP principles. Phase Three workshops, designed for this purpose, will be more time and resource intensive than those developed previously--workshops should involve, for example, the development of RBP tools and practices in cooperation with participants. Because they aim to refine existing programming methodology, workshops should be offered for individual organizations--or only between organizations having very similar missions and operating environments.

The general framework should be the same for all Phase Three Workshops--participants should be oriented on and asked to work through a set of generic tools designed to address different types of issues. Both during the workshop and thereafter, programmers will be asked to develop the tools as necessary to best suit their organizational programming needs.

The three types of RBP tools suggested should accomplish the following:

- **Situation-Analysis Tools:** The function of these tools is to help programmers integrate into their program designs a better awareness of the contexts in which people live and the root causes of their suffering. They should be designed, for example, to help programmers think through the economic, social, cultural, civil, political, attitudinal, institutional and military context in which people live. The overall aim of rights-based situation-analysis tools is to identify those factors and dynamics which undermine people's ability to achieve their human rights.

- **Impact-Analysis Tools:** The function of these tools to help programmers think through the potential cross-sectoral impact of projects. They should be designed to help programmers consider the impact of programs on people's human rights.

- **Decision-Making Tools:** These tools aim to help decision-makers decide what to do when faced with various potential or actual impacts of programming on people's rights. They should help programmers weigh possibilities, determine how to mitigate negative impacts, and establish thresholds and bottom lines for those impacts.

In facilitating these exercises, trainers should provide an adequate framework to yield a useful tool for programmers. At the outset, this may mean providing no more than a skeletal framework for the first trainees. As tools are developed with organizations, however, that experience should be shared with other trainees, who may want to suggest developments or organization-specific modifications.

The following table suggests the content, objectives and methodology for Phase Three Workshops.

PHASE THREE: DEVELOPING RBP STRATEGIES & TOOLS		
Content of Workshop	**Objective**	**Methodology**
Workshop 1: Understanding the rights context in which programming occurs		
❑ **Understanding the Context in Which Programmes Operate.** Situation-analysis tools for programmers	❑ To help pax identify the root causes of rights deprivations--analyzing e.g. the psycho-social, cultural, political and security context in which programmes occur	❑ Orient and then work with pax to develop to do analyze the contexts in which they work.
Workshop 2: Understanding our impact on rights		
❑ **Understanding the Cross-Sectoral Impact of Programmes** Impact-analysis tools for Programmers	❑ To help pax think through cross-sectoral positive and negative impacts of programs, both intended and unintended.	❑ Orient & work with pax to develop tools to stimulate thinking on cross-sectoral impacts.
Workshop 3: Making Decisions that promote rights		
❑ **Making rights based Decisions in Programming** Decision-making tools for programmers	❑ To help programmers weigh alternative options, minimize effects that undermine rights , maximize the promotion of rights, and make decisions in morally difficult contexts	❑ Orient and then work with pax to develop decision-making tools to help them choose a course of action when faced with rights dilemmas.

B. Implementing the Modules and Workshops

The success of this initiative will depend largely on how the modules and workshops are implemented within the aid community. Two different approaches are worth reviewing in further detail. On the one hand, one could hire an individual or team to *directly train programmers* and run workshops on an ongoing basis. On the other hand, one could engage a consultant or consultants to provide *training of trainers* from organizations, coordinate the tools development workshops and then provide on-going support. The following section lays out important factors that should be considered in deciding on the training approach. Thereafter, a Table compares the two approaches proposed above against each other.

1. Developing an Afghan Centered Approach

If this initiative is to have a sustainable impact in the Afghan context, ownership of the process should ultimately fall into Afghan hands. Although in the short-term, (2-3 years) the initiative should be coordinated by the HRA, and may require expertise beyond that currently existing in the assistance community, the initiative should be designed to become internally and indigenously run in the long-term. As discussed previously, however, there is considerable skepticism in the Afghan community about the universality of human rights, and its relevance to their programming work. If this initiative is to overcome doubts about its appropriateness in the Afghan context, it must be Afghan centered in approach. This means making materials Afghan centered--in terms of language, approach and content. It also makes the selection of trainers an important issue. An Afghan trainer, or at least, a trainer who speaks the local language has a distinct advantage in promoting buy-in to the relevance of human rights in Afghanistan. Although training for some aid workers can and probably should be in

English, training for community based aid workers should be conducted in Pashtu or Dari.

2. *Focussing on Sustainable Impact*

One cannot offer once-off training if one hopes to effectively change programming within organizations. Staff transition, non-familiarity with the subject matter, the lack of a reading culture within aid organizations generally, and basic pedagogical principles indicate that repetitive training on a cyclical basis should be undertaken. Although important for Phase One modules, it is absolute critical in Phase Three--the actual application of the tools. Without this type of follow-up, programming tools will probably get shelved or used ineffectively.

3. *Prioritizing Training Methodology over Substance*

The aim of this initiative is not to change what programmers *know*, but how they *think* about programming. Its purpose is to first to generate interest and then to help them broaden their analytical skills to incorporate human rights considerations during programming. To create this buy-in, training methodology is critical. Trainers who focus too much on substance may forget that getting to the right answer is not as important as becoming engaged in the debate, and committed to changing one's own approach. Trainers who understand this are a rarity. When one considers one is looking for people with both human rights and humanitarian experience, the challenge of finding appropriate trainers is more difficult still.

The following table summarizes pros and cons of each option.

COMPARING THE OPTIONS

	Option A	Option B
Description	**Hire individual or team of full-time staff to directly train programmers on an ongoing basis.**	**Engage individual or team of consultants to train trainers from organizations**
Developing an Afghan Centered Approach	❑ If some or all team members are skilled Afghan trainer(s), it will allow more time to contextualize training tools	❑ The challenge will be getting the buy-in of in house staff. Having at least one team member with a strong Afghanistan background is critical.
Focussing on Sustainable impact	❑ Highly contingent on the quality of trainers and level of resources. Might require a more focussed approach, working on a long term basis with select interested organizations.	❑ A useful compromise if resources or the proposed time-line are limited. ❑ Because it taps into a wider pool of in house-trainers, there will be more diversity of impact. Some organizations will change little, others may develop RBP in meaningful ways.
Prioritizing methodology over substance	❑ Advantage is the ongoing control over conduct of modules, and the ability of full-time staff to develop their skills.	❑ A greater likelihood of finding a training "expert", but significant resources will be required to train trainers in methodology.
Logistical Costs and Benefits	❑ Will make greater demands of the HRA office (esp. in the short term in terms of management and orientation). ❑ Easier to control direction of initiative and ensure it remains focussed on changing programming	❑ Less demands on the HRA office as organizations do much of the in-house training. ❑ Less control of the direction in which organizations take RBP (ergo more room for creative approaches)

4. Recommended Course of Action

Providing trainings directly and training in-house trainers both have their merits and shortcomings. Either strategy could work well if the right person or team is found. Because this will be the main challenge of this initiative and the most important to overcome, both options should be considered simultaneously. Proposed strategy steps are as follows:

1. Identify Point Person or Team: A search should be conducted both within the local job market (for a full-time position) and more broadly within the international human rights, education and consulting communities. Ideally, the trainer(s) should have experience working in Afghanistan, strong training skills, familiarity with human rights, and some experience with aid programming.

2. Modules Should Be Developed As Teacher Training Tools: Even if a full-time person or team is hired to directly train programming staff, modules should be developed so that they can be used independently by interested organizations--this will enhance their longevity (hopefully beyond the term of this training initiative) and increase potential for reaching a wider audience, both within and beyond Afghanistan. *Teacher training tools are largely distinguished by the additional attention paid to orienting users on the use of resources.* In this vein, all modules should be translated into appropriate languages.

3. Select Participating Organizations: Training should be offered to all in the Afghanistan assistance community. Invitations should clarify that a range of agencies will be selected from interested respondents. Selections should aim to identify local, international and UN aid agencies (demonstrating interest at both programming and policy making levels) with the capacity to implement RBP ideas in programming. An important strategy issue is whether to concentrate one's efforts on agencies working in a particular sector or geographic area, or to seek to train a more diverse range of actors.

The Consultant recommends that Module One and Two training should be provided to a broad range of actors, but RBP-tools training (Module Three) should be offered, initially, to a group of aid organizations working in a particular geographic area on a pilot basis. This will enhance the feasibility of doing follow-up, of coordinating trainings and programming, and enhance the possibility of doing effective impact assessments at a later date. It makes less sense to limit participants by sector, as one of the core elements of rights-based programming is to encourage cross-sectoral approach to aid work.

4. Provide Training: Depending on available resources, training should be provided either directly to programming staff or to in-house trainers within organizations. Training should ultimately reach ***all*** senior policy staff and programming decision-makers within the Country Offices of interested organizations.

All trainings should be designed to be as "hands on" as possible, engaging participants in problem solving, directly applying skills to actual programming contexts. The Modules in Phase One and Two are straightforward in this regard--their main purpose is to orient participants to a new field of interest, and to illustrate the relevance of that field to their work. Phase Three Workshops, however, are

somewhat different. The purpose here is to work with participants to develop tools that facilitate rights-based programming.

5. Provide Follow Up: Follow up for each of the types of modules is essential. For the introductory modules in Phase One, and subject-specific modules in Phase Two, do not underestimate the power of repetition. All of these workshops will be content-heavy, and it expects a lot to have participants understand and retain the bulk of ideas shared. In the proposed timeline for implementation (Appendix D), it is recommended that Phase One and Two Modules are repeated every three months.

For Phase Three Modules, follow up is also critical. Once tools have been developed in workshops, follow up should focus on helping programmers develop their RBP tools in concrete settings. This will often require intensive one-on-one sessions, on an on-going basis with programmers or in house RBP trainers.

CONCLUSION

In a professional environment where new tools and rhetoric come and go, rights-based programming risks being discarded as a new cover on an old story. Yet there is little doubt that it has great potential to reorient aid practices in Afghanistan in concrete and positive ways. Rights-based programming reminds us of why and how we ought to do aid work. It can help us achieve a better understanding of the contexts in which we work, think more creatively about the impact of our work, and make better decisions when faced with difficult ethical dilemmas.

Afghanistan provides a unique environment for undertaking this exciting initiative, in such a way that it makes a genuine difference to the work of aid actors. The aid community appears committed to working together to have a sustainable positive impact in Afghanistan, and important strides have already been taken in developing a coherent assistance effort. The community is rich in creative thinkers willing to try new ideas and approaches to improve the delivery of services. In most organizations, experienced national and international staff provide essential day-to-day leadership and guidance, to ensure that programmes make sense in the Afghanistan context. Given enough creative organization, time, and resources, this initiative should yield programming tools that get beyond rhetoric and make a concrete difference to the dignity and self-worth of the Afghan people.

APPENDIX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

HUMAN RIGHTS; REVIEW OF TRAINING

FOR PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN AFGHANISTAN ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

In line with the objectives set out in the 1999 Appeal concerning the Protection and Advancement of Human Rights and, in particular, with reference to the need "to ensure that assistance activities are geared to promote all human rights" this Terms of Reference concerns a short-term consultancy to review, and make recommendations on, existing resources available for training and orientation on human rights law and its implementation.

Under the overall supervision of the UN Coordinator for Afghanistan, and reporting directly to the Human Rights Advisor, a consultant shall be recruited to undertake the following tasks:

1) Undertake a review of existing training and orientation on human rights, to identify (a) existing materials and relevance to rights-based programming (b) gaps which need to be addressed, and (c) measures which can be taken to enhance existing resources dedicated to raising awareness of human rights standards in general and rights-based programming in particular.

2) On the basis of consultation and strategizing sessions with a cross-section of concerned agencies to make proposals on content and mode of training/orientation for different audiences including policy-makers and aid practitioners.

3) Undertake a number of pilot-training sessions to test training packages or modules designed to equip different audiences with an improved understanding (a) of human rights in general and (b) rights-based programming.

4) Provide a brief summary report at the conclusion of the consultancy on overall experience and make proposals for future training and orientation activities.

Timeframe: the consultancy will be for a period of five weeks

Qualifications: Law Degree with a specific focus on international human rights and humanitarian law and experience in training in rights-based programming in countries in crisis.

Appendix B: Acronyms

CCA	Cooperation Centre for Afghanistan
CPAU	Cooperation for Peace And Unity
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)
CSR	Convention on the Status of Refugees (1951)
DEVAW	Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women (1993)
DPWCEAC	Declaration on the Protection of Women and Children in Emergency and Armed Conflict (1974)
GDIP	Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement
HP	Humanitarian Principles
HRA	Human Rights Advisor
HRL	Human Rights Law
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IOM	International Organization For Migration
pax	participants
RBP	Rights based programming

Appendix C: People Interviewed in one-on-one meetings and/or in Consultative Groups

Name	Organization, Location
Ahad, Abdul	SCF-US, Islamabad
Amiri, Haq	UN Coordinators Office, Islamabad
Atmar, Hanif	Norwegian Church Aid, Peshawar
Bratlie, Odd	Norwegian Aid Committee, Peshawar
Campbell, Shon	Save the Children Fund-UK, Islamabad
Claysom, Paula	UNICEF, Islamabad
Coleridge, Peter	CDAP, Peshawar
Daud, Altaf	HABITAT, Kabul
De Mul, Erick	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Dolder, Marcus	ICRC, Kabul
Donelli, Eric	UNICEF, Kabul
Donini, Antonio	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Ehsan-Zia, Mohammed	CPAU, Peshawar
Farooq, Wardaq	CDAP, Peshawar
Faruqi, Farhana	WHO (currently on leave), Islamabad
Habib, Gulalai	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Hesami, Karima	UN Coordinators Office, Islamabad
Hussaini, Sarwar	Cooperation Center for Afghanistan, Peshawar
Ihadhim, Rahela	HABITAT, Islamabad
Iseli, Peter	ICRC, Islamabad
Johnson, Chris	OXFAM, Islamabad
Kaye, Chris,	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Kristin Lunden	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Latif Matin, Abdul	UN Mine Awareness Programme, Kabul
Lummp, Katarina	UNHCR, Islamabad
McFadden, Charles	Agency Coordinating Body for Afghan Relief
Melek, Maysoon	Gender Advisor, UNC Office, Islamabad
Mervyn Patterson	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Michael Semple	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Naveed, Sadozai	WHO, Kabul
Nezam, Nafisa	UNOPS, Islamabad
Niland, Norah	UNC Office, Islamabad
Noori, Dr.	NOORI, Kabul
Peter Bolling	Swedish Committee for Afghanistan
Popal, Ghulam Jelani	Afghanistan Development Association
Rahimy, Mohamad	Swiss Aid To Afghanistan, Peshawar
Reynolds, Samantha	HABITAT, Islamabad
Rossano, Letizia	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Sahibzada, Sayed Aqa	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Schmitt, Katharima	WFP, Kabul
Simon-Taha, Alexandra	WHO, Islamabad
Sitara	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Staermouse, Tina	IOM, Islamabad
Stuart Worsley	CARE
Van Neck, Rensje	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Wijeyesekera, Anouja	UNICEF, Islamabad
Wilder, Andrew	SCF-US, Islamabad
Yaftali, Ariana	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad
Yannoutsou, Sophie	UN Coordinator's Office, Islamabad

APPENDIX D

TO: PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP ON JULY 19TH, 1999

FROM: PAUL O'BRIEN

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS

DATE: 08/09/99

INTRODUCTION

Over the past three weeks I have had the opportunity to meet with a wide range of aid workers to discuss human rights and rights based programming generally and training issues specifically in the Afghan context. This paper reviews *some* of the ideas, hopes and concerns heard during these meetings. As much as possible, ideas are presented as I heard them, with some effort to organize them to avoid repetition and to structure the various types of comments. None of these findings represent "conclusions" or together constitute a plan of action. Nor does the paper capture all of the important points raised by interviewees. The aim, rather, is to give readers a flavor of the major themes that arose during discussions, and to stimulate your own ideas in preparation for our meeting on July 19th.

CULTURAL ISSUES

Probably the most cross-cutting theme in interviews related to cultural issues. Most agreed that any human rights training initiative must take into account, in practical terms, both the history of the modern human rights movement and how it relates to Afghan culture.

Some felt that human rights thinking has been dominated by western/northern liberal philosophy which sanctifies the individual as the central "unit" to be protected in society. In Afghan culture, some suggest, there is a greater sense of group identity, which focuses on protection of the family and larger kinship networks as society's fundamental unit. In other words, they suggest, Afghans have a less individualistic and more collective rights perspective.

Similarly, if human rights identify minimum conditions for "dignity and self-worth", some noted that an Afghan concept of human rights might be framed differently from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Some suggested that cultural conformity, understood as the capacity to integrate one's own personality with the social order, may be considered a source of dignity in Afghan culture rather than an impairment to it. Whereas freely choosing one's religion may be a prerequisite for self-worth in predominantly secular societies, Afghans may not perceive it as such. Some distinguished human rights as secular by definition--being human centered, they cannot be given or taken away by God, a position which some would argue is contradictory to the essence of Islam.

INTRODUCTION

The protection and advancement of human rights is one of the central strategic aims of the aid effort in Afghanistan. It is enshrined in the assistance community's "Strategic Framework". It provides the *raison d'être* for one of the five Thematic Groups, and it is a common subject of discussion among those working in and on Afghanistan. Not surprisingly, therefore, many assistance workers have indicated interest in learning more about human rights and how they might be helpful to the aid effort in Afghanistan.

In consultation with the Consultative Group on Rights Based Programming[1], the Human Rights Advisor ("HRA") retained a consultant in July 1999 (the "Consultant") to review existing human training strategies, and to identify possible steps to promote awareness of human rights in general and rights-based programming ("RBP") in particular.

In summary form, the Terms of Reference required the Consultant to: (1) review existing human rights training resources, identify gaps and possible measures to enhance existing resources, (2) meet with an array of policy makers and aid practitioners to discuss the content and methodology of a possible training initiative, (3) undertake pilot training sessions to test training packages on human rights and rights based programming and (4) report in writing on findings and make proposals for future training activities on human rights and rights based programming.

Having already completed tasks (1) through (3) above, this paper fulfills task (4) and constitutes the Consultant's final report. It is structured as follows:

- First, it defines the Consultant's conclusion and overall proposal;
- Second, it provides an overview of the Consultant's findings;
- Third, it reviews the meaning and implications of "rights-based programming"; and
- Finally, it makes recommendations for moving forward with a training programme on human rights and rights-based programming for aid actors in Afghanistan.

I. OVERALL CONCLUSION & PROPOSAL

Based on interviews, group consultations, and previous experience and research, the Consultant concluded that the HRA office should develop a training initiative with the following specific objectives:

A. Develop training modules to provide interested aid actors working on Afghanistan with (1) a solid understanding of the history, sources and moral and legal relevance of human rights and humanitarian law norms to Afghanistan, and (2) a shared understanding of the meaning of rights-based programming.

---

[1] The Human Rights Consultative Group is made up of policy makers and aid practitioners from NGOs and UN agencies. They meet from time to time to discuss strategies for the promotion of rights-based programming in Afghanistan.

Others strongly disagreed with arguments regarding the relativism of human rights, emphasizing that Islam is grounded in human rights, and it explicitly holds, for example, that religion should be freely chosen. They were concerned that focussing too much on cultural sensitivities might undermine the moral strength of human rights as universally applicable norms. They see a human rights approach as an opportunity to reorient discussion in Afghanistan to the true values of Islam--non-discrimination and respect for human rights for all. They pointed out that average Afghans want the rights in the Universal Declaration as much as any other people.

Most felt, however, that the effectiveness of any training strategy would depend on whether it recognizes and addresses Afghan skepticism about the cultural biases in traditional human rights thinking. Significant thought should be given to promoting Afghan ownership of human rights principles. Training need to be grounded, therefore, within a strong understanding of Afghan culture.

POLITICAL ISSUES

Some felt that rights are inherently political, promoting a paradigm of liberal secular democracy. Others noted that rights language has been used selectively and arbitrarily in Afghanistan to promote particular political viewpoints, e.g. it focuses heavily on treatment of women in Afghanistan while ignoring women's rights violations in other countries, both in the South and North. Moreover, these political positions do not contextualize human rights conditions historically. They do not acknowledge the history of human rights abuses in Northern states (e.g. slavery, racism, economic discrimination) nor within Afghanistan prior to the Taliban (e.g. human rights conditions before and during the Soviet era).

Much of this critique focussed on donors, and challenged donors for demanding human rights accountability on one hand, while fueling human rights deprivations on the other (through policies of economic isolationism and military support of various parties). Many sensed that donors focus on civil and political rights rather than economic social or cultural rights, even though the latter rights may be a higher priority for the Afghan people, e.g. the rights to food security, health, and an adequate standard of living.

Most noted that in particularly in the rights arena, assistance activities should not be undermined by narrow or politically expedient donor agendas, and that donors should educated to develop a more consistent approach to human rights in Afghanistan. Some suggested a coordinated commitment on human rights could provide NGOs with the solidarity to resist counterproductive donor influence. Others felt it could make it easier for donors to influence NGO policy--coordination can undermine the diversity of ideas.

It was suggested that rights based programming should be used to educate political actors to consider human rights issues beyond "narcotics, terrorism and gender". Another person thought that donors should be brought into the training process, and training should be used to change the sources from which they usually get their information/agendas (usually national policy departments, academics and sometimes aid actors). If necessary, donor specific training should be tailored for their needs, level of knowledge etc.

Some thought that training could avoid partisan political interests by focussing on the universal applicability of human rights, and yet, in terms of strategy, be grounded in an Afghan reality. Training can and should be non-partisan politically, they suggested, while being culturally centered at the same time. Such training should focus not only on rights deprivations, but on rights achievements, both by the assistance community and by Afghan communities.

COORDINATION ISSUES

A number suggested the need to address how rights-based programming might concretely enhance the larger coordination effort in Afghanistan, not simply in terms of the articulation of principles or overarching themes, but in ways that improve the well-being of Afghan communities.

No-one questioned the utility of a coordinated effort to increase assistance actors' substantive awareness of human rights and its applicability to their work. However, people raised the danger of this promoting an inward-looking dynamic for aid actors--coordination and training give the appearance that something concrete is happening, but don't necessarily lead to any benefits for Afghans.

One person commented that for training to make a concrete difference, there would have to be systemic change based on a genuine commitment to promote human rights from all levels of the organizations involved. Within the UN, buy-in would be essential at the heads of agencies level, within senior management in the UN Coordinator's office, and in certain cases, at the headquarter level for various UN bodies. It was observed that a coordinated human rights strategy will require not only commitments to act, but also to forbear from acting in ways inconsistent with the agreed upon strategic objectives. Those shared objectives might include determining (1) when to do human rights advocacy or focus attention on particular investigations/human rights issues, (2) what rights violations to address, (3) working with the Afghan authorities, and (4) how aid actors can hold themselves accountable for promoting (or failing to promote) the human rights of Afghans.

Coordination should not be a euphemism for control. If this appears too "UN centered" an exercise, it may alienate people unnecessarily. Agencies should be free to adopt lessons from the training as they please and to use innovation in pushing their own human rights agendas forward. They should also be free to critique the larger aid effort, including incidences where human rights of clients are undermined by other assistance actors.

THE PROCESS AND CONTENT OF TRAINING

No one disagreed with dividing training into clear modules to reflect the fact that different agencies have different levels of knowledge and different needs. It was noted that development oriented organizations may have greater need for rights based programming than organizations doing short term emergency projects. Others voiced particular needs regarding human rights advocacy, monitoring strategies and

21

implementation. NGOs doing legal aid, conflict resolution and peace building wanted more in-depth understanding of human rights generally.

It was suggested that any training strategy should involve both workshops and "on the job" learning. Following training, for example, organizations should be assisted in concretely incorporating learnings into their work--services and tools should be provided to help them in that incorporation effort, which could be followed up again with debriefing and brainstorming workshops.

A number of different ways to determine training content were suggested. Apart from the introductory modules which should provide general orientation on human rights and humanitarian law, possible focus areas could be determined by (1) identifying the highest priority rights to client communities in Afghanistan--i.e. ask the client community, (2) identifying those rights most closely related to assistance work (e.g. economic, social and cultural rights like rights to food, education, health and freedom from poverty), (3) identifying rights of greatest concern to the controlling authorities in order to create greater space for rights training generally, or (4) focussing on strategic areas where rights concerns are greatest and have most cross-cutting relevance--e.g. women's rights, child rights, minority rights and non-discrimination rights, rights to education and freedom of religion etc.

Regarding rights based programming specifically, it was noted that training should focus on implementation, and if possible should introduce tools that can be used to help programmers make rights-based decisions. Training should aim to integrate rights based programming themes into existing frameworks. It should not be presented as a new sector, but as a methodological tool to help aid actors refine their current assistance strategies.

All agreed that understanding the legal framework for human rights is important, but getting beyond this is critical for assistance actors. One person commented that a rights based approach will make a concrete difference if it effects not what we "know", but what we "do". It should focus not on the gaps in our knowledge base, but on the attitudinal response to those gaps. Others agreed that training needs to be tailored to changing attitudes. It should not focus on particular rights and strategies for addressing particular abuses, but instead should help us address our methodology and relationship to the people we serve.

One person cautioned that training should address dangers of getting involved in monitoring and witnessing in the Afghan context (reporting human rights abuses). If NGOs want this capacity, training should assist them in (1) addressing the security of personnel and clients and (2) help them base any assertions around violations on facts rather than rumors.

SELECTING TRAINEES

Some felt rights based programming should be integrated as quickly as possible into the general workings of the entire assistance community in Afghanistan. Others suggested that the process should be done in phases, working initially with a group of committed

and influential actors, building some foundations, and only subsequently introducing rights based programming more broadly.

Views diverged on the target level of seniority within organizations. Some felt one should focus on programmers--those who could make rights based programming decisions. Others suggested targeting the higher levels of the UN and of NGOs to build institutional support and momentum. All recognized that training should ultimately be comprehensive. Some observed that introducing a new vocabulary may create tensions between those "trained" and those who find ideas unfamiliar and possibly threatening. This may occur not only between, but also within organizations.

TRAINING FOR NON-ASSISTANCE COMMUNITY

In practical terms, some felt that if the aim is to build human rights bridges with the Afghan authorities, they should be given the opportunity to define what human rights mean to them--a forum or series of forums for Afghan-authority controlled discussions of human rights was suggested by some, which could subsequently be followed by discussions between the authorities and aid actors on implementation issues. Others felt that such a strategy might be counter-productive, leading to retrenchment of the more conservative Taliban policies, and would not lead to bridge building on key human rights issues. They favored an engaged approach between aid actors and the authorities from the outset. Such an approach should, in particular, promote the legitimizing function of human rights -- i.e. if the Taliban want to be taken seriously as competent authorities by the community of nations, they will need to recognize their human rights obligations, and should be encouraged to do so. A third proposed strategy for introducing rights thinking in Afghanistan was that training should move out in concentric circles, starting from within the assistance community, with the aim of promoting an Afghan to Afghan educational process on human rights.

Any initiative to introduce human rights more broadly in Afghanistan should consider carefully how and when to bring groups with different interests together. Most recommended starting out by working separately with ethnic, religious, and gender groups and only later bringing them together for human rights discussions.

Some considered it essential that account should be taken of the transitory nature of most assistance personnel. An emphasis should be placed on either tailoring training strategies to the reality of personnel transition in the aid community, or finding those in that community who will build long-term sustainable relationships. In a similar vein, several interviewees voiced concerns at getting too modular or structured in one's approach to building human rights momentum. In what was described as the "green-tea" strategy, it was suggested that any effort to introduce human rights to a broader audience adopt local media for the exchange of ideas and above all, listen with patience—to help instill a genuine confidence in international human rights norms, the aid community will have to accomplish in a few short years a task which remains incomplete in other contexts after centuries of debate.

APPENDIX E: Proposed Timeline for Project

Stage	Sep. 1999	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan 2000	Feb	Mar	April	May	June	July	Aug
Identify trainers/consultants												
Develop Phase 1 & 2 modules												
Phase 1 & 2 Training												
Select Area of Focus for RBP												
Develop Phase 3 workshops												
Conduct Phase 3 workshops												
Refine Phase 3 workshops												
Follow up w RBProgrammers												

Annex F

Budget

Item	Number	Total	Cost
Consultant Costs			
Phase One: Introductory Modules			
Preparation of Materials	5 days for each of 3 modules	15 days	$6000
Training Sessions	Each module is 4 days (incl. 1 day of prep/organization.). Each module is given twice per year to 2 diff. groups in Kabul, & 4 diff. groups in Islamabad/ Peshawar	12 Sessions 48 days	$19,200
Phase Two: Modules on Demand			
Preparation of Materials	5 days for each of 4 modules	20 days	$8000
Training Sessions	Four different types of modules Each session is 3 days (incl. 1 day of prep/organization) Each session given once per year To one group in Kabul & 2 groups in Islamabad/ Peshawar.	12 Sessions 36 days	$14,400
Phase Three: RBP Modules			
Preparation	10 days for RBP Workshops (including one trip into pilot study region)	10 days	$4000
Workshops	Session is 5 days (incl. 1 day of prep/organization) Sessions given twice in first year to NGOs working in the region.	2 sessions 10 days	$4000
Follow Up	10 days for follow up activities, working with specific NGOs to monitor, evaluate and refine RBP implementation efforts	10 days	$4000
Travel & Accomodation Expenditures			
Travel to/from region	3 trips (Once for prep. twice for workshops, once for follow up	4 international trips	$4000
Travel within region for Phase One and Two workshops	To from Peshawar & Kabul on each trip (Phase 1 and 2 trips folded together)	12 regional trips	$6000
For RBP workshops	To RPB pilot site	3 regional trips	$6,000
Training/Workshop Expenses			
Phase One Training Sessions	12 sessions (3 days each)	36 days	$7,200
Phase Two Training Sessions	12 sessions (2 days each)	24 days	$4,800
Phase Three Workshops	2 sessions (4 days each)	8 days	$1,600
Documentation and Administration Costs			
Copying, documentation and Administration for each workshop	Phase 1: 12 sess. with 50 people Phase 2: 12 sess. with 20 people Phase 3: 2 sess. with 20 people	26 sessions/ workshops	$6,500
Total			$95,700

B. Work with interested aid actors to pilot a set of rights-based programming tools to help them (1) identify human rights considerations in their target communities, (2) consider the impact of their programmes in human rights terms, and (3) improve the impact of their programmes in human rights terms.

II. FINDINGS

The consultant met with a number of Afghanistan assistance actors in Peshawar, Islamabad and Kabul between July 1 and July 29, 1999 (see Appendix C for Interviewee list). He also engaged in a number of round-table consultations with the Consultative Group on Rights-Based Programming, UN assistance actors in Kabul, and members of the UN Coordinators office in Islamabad. Each of those groups was made up of international staff and Afghan nationals.

These findings summarize cross-cutting issues raised in various meetings. They review (1) the types of needs and interests in the community, (2) existing resources, (3) contextual concerns voiced by interviewees, and (4) shared conclusions on this initiative.

A. Types of Needs and Interests

Findings confirmed that there was already a high level of demand for training on human rights and rights-based programming in the assistance community. Even amongst organizations already thinking in human rights terms, interest in accessing further resources was high. The spectrum of needs and interests across the various organizations, however, was quite broad and can loosely be categorized as follows:

TABLE 1: CATEGORIES OF INTEREST IN HUMAN RIGHTS TRAINING

Background in Human Rights	Example	Type of Interest
Organizations with core missions to advocate for or educate on human rights or related issues	**CCA** **CPAU**	Want thorough training on human rights mechanisms, rights education, advocacy, and enforcement procedures
Organizations already actively engaged in some human rights training on specific issues	**Save the Children Alliance** **UNICEF**	Want help contextualizing their experience and expertise within the larger human rights framework
Organizations already viewing their work from a rights perspective, but not yet engaged in education in Afghanistan	**Oxfam** **CARE**	Want help that complements their internal education effort & provides tools to promote rights-based decision-making
Organizations for whom human rights is a new but growing interest area	**The majority of organizations**	Want general introductory training

All interviewees expressed interest in exposing their staff to general human rights training, covering the history of the human rights movement, major frameworks, and its moral and legal relevance to aid work. Regarding more specific subject matter, interest levels varied widely in organizations. It appears, therefore, that this initiative should offer both general overviews tailored for the entire community, and more detailed modules on specific issues provided on a demand basis for those with specific interests. Training on rights-based programming in particular, should offer both general overviews and more in-depth workshops for those committed to developing a rights-based approach to aid.

B. Resources in the Community

There is some potential for resource sharing in terms of specific-subject areas. Certain organizations, for example, may be willing and able to train others on particular subjects: ICRC, for example, has expertise in humanitarian law, and UNHCR or IOM may be able to share resources on the rights of displaced persons. Members of the Save the Children Alliance and UNICEF have resources and expertise in child rights, and have done some education on this subject for their own staff and for communities. No organization, however, has developed training modules designed to be used, as is, for other members of the aid community.

Human resources follow a similar pattern. While there are no full-time human rights trainers, there are individuals who have conducted training workshops on human rights and related issues for their own organizations and Afghan communities. With adequate orientation, those individuals could be in a position to do cross-organizational training on human rights. Most organizations, did appear interested in identifying individuals within their organizations who could be trained as in-house trainers on human rights.

Having reviewed an array of materials used by various aid actors in the Afghanistan context, the Consultant found that all would require significant adaptation or supplementation before being shared with the wider community. His conclusion, therefore, was that there was a need for the development of training materials, tailored specifically for the Afghanistan assistance community on human rights and rights-based programming.

C. Contextual Concerns and Interests--Addressing issues of politics and culture

Interviewees were asked to identify challenges to implementing an effective human rights training initiative in the Afghan context. Foremost amongst the challenges raised were those relating to politics and culture.

A number of interviewees, for example, (both Afghan nationals and internationals) believe that human rights arguments have been used selectively by the international community to promote partisan political viewpoints. Human rights, some suggested, reflect western political values, and human rights advocacy, they argued, continues to focus on (1) civil and political rights in Afghanistan, promoting a paradigm of liberal secular democracy; (2) gender discrimination in Afghanistan, even though similar issues arise in many other contexts,[2] and (3) Afghanistan's human rights failings and obligations,

[2] There was little doubt among interviewees that the Afghan women's human rights are violated on a frightening scale. Some were concerned, however, that Afghanistan had been singled out as abusive of gender-related rights, while far less attention is paid to abuses suffered by women both in neighboring countries and in Northern states. Rights-based programming may be a powerful tool in this regard. By

with little acknowledgement of the international community's own obligations to help promote, or at least, not undermine the human rights of Afghans.

On the cultural front, similar issues were raised. Some interviewees suggested that a human rights approach will not work in Afghan culture[3], because (1) human rights are individualistic in orientation, whereas most Afghan communities think more collectively; (2) human rights are "human" centered, whereas "Afghan culture" is God centered, (3) human rights are "entitlement" oriented, whereas Afghans think more in terms of "obligations".

Whatever the legitimacy of these various perceptions, they should be taken seriously. Without compromising its goal, the training initiative should recognize and address skepticism about the political and cultural biases in traditional human rights thinking. The challenge will be to underline the universal applicability of human rights norms, while ensuring that it is grounded in a strong understanding of Afghan culture and political identity. The balance is critical here--too much focus on cultural or political sensitivities might undermine the moral strength of human rights. Its worth saying that one of the long-term benefits of promoting human rights in Afghanistan should be to reorient moral debate to the central values of Afghan culture and Islam--non-discrimination and respect for dignity and self-worth of all human beings.

Whether any training initiative will adequately address these concerns will depend on the stated and perceived rationale for the initiative, the training methodology (when, how, and by whom) and of course, the content of training modules.

D. Cross-cutting Conclusions

All interviewees were asked about certain core themes, including the content, methodology and audience for a possible training initiative. While viewpoints varied on some issues, certain viewpoints were held almost universally across interviewees. They are summarized as follows.

- ❒ **Content:** Interviewees advised that the proposed training initiative should not be too legalistic. It should focus more on the moral imperatives underlying human rights law. It should provide a background on legal frameworks only to the extent necessary to make participants comfortable with using human rights ideas appropriately and effectively.

  In its early stages, the initiative should be strategic about raising contentious human rights issues, such as discrimination against women, freedom of religion, and the right to education. While all agreed on the necessity to address such issues in the long-term, too early or too broad an effort to raise these issues could undermine the larger goal of building understanding of human rights and rights based programming. Similarly education on human rights work that risks putting

---

asking programmers to (1) identify and (2) address the needs of the most marginalized groups, it may refocus attention on gender discrimination while avoiding attributions of "politicization" of this issue.

[3] The terms "Afghan culture" and "Afghans" are used simplistically throughout the document for ease of presentation--as many interviewees made clear, there is a wide diversity of cultural heritages and practices in Afghanistan. It hardly needs to be said that individual Afghan perspectives on human rights are as diverse as they are in any other context. It remains useful, however, to identify thematic viewpoints for purposes of developing a training programme that will be effective in Afghanistan.

aid actors and their programs in jeopardy (such as monitoring and documentation of human rights abuses) should be made available on a demand basis, provided only to those who request it.

- **Methodology:** Interviewees believed that if it is to have a sustainable impact, the initiative should focus on developing Afghan expertise in human rights and rights-based programming, and be tailored (both in content and repetitiousness) to address learning skills and staff-turnover. It should, where possible, be presented by Afghans in local languages, and use local case-studies, examples and issues of concern. It should contain components that allow participants to apply their learning in actual programming contexts, either through workshops that address actual programming dilemmas, or by offering consulting services on an ad hoc basis.

- **Audience:** Interviewees suggested that the audience for the training initiative should be developed in concentric circles. It should start out targeting those aid actors who demonstrate a genuine interest in rights-based programming, and expand within the assistance community as interest in the initiative grows. Efforts to educate either Afghan communities or controlling authorities directly should not be incorporated into this initiative, although hopefully, subsequent initiatives by aid actors themselves would work with these audiences.

III. RIGHTS-BASED PROGRAMMING: ITS MEANING AND IMPLICATIONS

To concretely improve the impact of aid programming in Afghanistan, an education initiative must not only orient aid actors to human rights theory and practice, but it must lead to real changes in how assistance is provided in Afghanistan. That is the function of "rights-based programming". A central objective of this initiative will be to develop a shared understanding of the meaning and implications of this type of programming.

A. The Meaning of "Rights-Based Programming".

For programming to be "rights-based," it must grow out of an articulated commitment to the realization of human rights, and must be designed to achieve stated human rights objectives. To understand what this means in practical terms, however, one needs to agree upon what is meant by "human rights". Human rights are those standards and norms set out in international human rights instruments that identify the necessary conditions for every human being to live with dignity and self-worth. Rights-based programming, therefore, is ***programming committed to achieving the necessary conditions for every human being to live with dignity and self-worth.***

How is rights-based programming different from the work we have been doing up to now? Many would argue that rights-based programming cannot be distinguished easily from good or effective programming, particularly if programmes are focussed on addressing inequalities. What distinguishes rights-based programming, however, is a *consciousness and a commitment*, translated into programme design, to achieve human rights objectives. These objectives should powerfully remind aid practitioners to give effect to

certain fundamental principles, many of which come under pressure in the real world of undertaking assistance in complex crises. For example:

- Because it is grounded in the principle of equality, rights-based programming focuses attention on the *most marginalized* and those victimized by structural discrimination. It provides a rationale for serving those who are more difficult to reach because of their marginal status. While an output-oriented programme may balk at the additional cost of reaching the most vulnerable, a rights approach justifies and demands such an effort. Also, by focusing on the most marginalized, rights-based programming provides a non-partisan justification for serving particularly vulnerable populations. Rights-based programming may focus on women or a particular ethnic group in a given context, for example, not because of their group identity, but because they are found to be marginalized in that context.

- Rights-based programming helps programmers to stay *impact* rather than output focussed. Because human rights identify all of the necessary conditions for living with dignity, they are the ultimate indicators of impact. From a rights perspective, programme output is of concern only to the extent that it leads to changes in people's human rights. As an indicator of impact, it is without compare. If a programme is improving people's overall human rights situation, it is having a positive impact, period.

- Human rights are comprehensively *cross-sectoral*, and therefore focus aid actors not only on the intended benefits of programmes within their sector of focus, but also on their unintended impacts within the wider context of programme operation.[4]

- Because it is cross-sectoral in orientation, a rights approach helps us to identify not only people's basic needs, but also *the root causes of suffering*. By helping aid programmers situate their work within the larger economic, social, cultural political, and military context in which it works, it refocuses programmes on treating the causes as well as the symptoms of suffering. As the preconditions for peace, human rights are particularly useful in conflict settings to focus aid actors on promoting capacities for peace while weakening the sources of tension between different groups.

- Finally, because it treats clients as "rights-bearers" rather than "beneficiaries", rights-based programming does not assume that the impact of aid will be positive. It holds itself *accountable* to improving people's dignity and self-worth, and considers anything less than that a failure to fulfill a moral commitment to the people programmes are intended to help.

B. Implications Of Rights Based Programming for The Afghanistan Aid Community

Some organizations in Afghanistan have been practicing aid for years with many of the above stated principles in mind, and have been working from a human rights perspective, either explicitly or implicitly, in developing their programs. Few, however, have

[4] Consider, for example, a food security project in a conflict zone that leads to injury and loss of life through food diversions to military operatives or by attracting violent actors to the community. A rights-based approach demands that during programme design, we consider the impact not only on people's food rights, but on rights such as life and personal security. Impact evaluation is measured in terms of overall well-being.

developed concrete tools that can be shared with others to help them engage in rights-based programming as described above.

If they are to fulfill their potential, rights-based programming tools should change how programmes are designed, implemented and evaluated. In sum, they should

(1) help aid actors better understand the contexts in which programmes are conceived, and the root causes of suffering in those contexts;

(2) help aid actors consider the likely cross-sectoral impacts of our programming, and increase the likelihood of having a net-positive impact on people's human rights, and

(3) help aid actors to make better decisions, informed primarily by the expected impact of those decisions on people's human rights.

Ultimately, rights based programming tools should focus aid actors on promoting the dignity and self-worth of rights-bearers. With that goal in mind, it should fundamentally inform how we provide (or decide not to provide) assistance.

---

[5] Organizations such as the Save Alliance members and UNICEF, for example, have been increasingly informed by the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and they have been promoting protection and advancement of these rights for several years.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

How can the Afghanistan aid community achieve a wider understanding and application of rights-based programming? The Consultant's recommendations seek to respond to that question. They map out a proposed training plan to facilitate shared learning between those with rights based programming experience and those new to this type of approach.

The elements of the recommended plan are as follows:

1. Phase One: Introductory Training Modules should be developed (a) to promote a shared understanding in the aid community of basic human rights principles and the meaning of rights-based programming, and (b) to agree upon an overall strategy for implementing rights-based programming tools in a specific context.

2. Phase Two: Having identified organizations with expertise in specific subject areas and willing to act as partners, subject-specific modules should be developed for those organizations with interests in particular human rights issues, such as rights of particular vulnerable populations, or human rights documentation, witnessing and enforcement.

3. Phase Three: Workshops should be convened to facilitate the development of rights-based programming tools that can then be piloted in a specific geographic context.

Following are specific recommendations on the content and proposed methodology for specific modules and workshops for each of those phases.

A. The Content Of Modules & Workshops

Each module and workshop should include the following:

- Introductory materials clarifying the aims, agenda, and proposed schedule of work,
- presentation materials for use by trainers (e.g. Powerpoint slides, overheads, and/or handouts etc. in both soft and hard-copy);
- clear instructions for trainers and/or facilitators on the use of presentation materials;
- learning exercises and case studies for participants, which should be Afghan specific;
- supporting materials for use by participants, including copies of presentation materials/reference materials for later use; and
- Dari and Pashtu translations of materials as appropriate.

Phase One: Introductory Modules

The first two introductory modules should provide interested members of the Afghanistan aid community with a basic understanding of human rights and rights based programming, and demonstrate the relevance of human rights to their work. If it achieves its aims, this phase will engender a genuine commitment among participants to engage in rights-based programming and the promotion of human rights generally in Afghanistan. These modules must be developed with the cultural and political mindset of Afghanistan in mind. They should demonstrate how rights-based programming can

enhance the effectiveness of aid interventions, working within the existing reality within which participants work.

The third introductory module should convene those interested in a collaborative rights-based programming initiative in a particular geographic context. The context selected should contain a diverse but manageable number of aid actors already present in the field, at least some of whom are strongly supportive of rights-based programming principles. The purpose of this module should be to frame the types of rights-based programming tools to be developed, and to start the organizational thought processes that will ultimately yield ideas on the content of those tools.

These modules should be offered with a particular focus on the needs, interest levels and learning capacity of (1) policy makers, and (2) programmers. The following table summarizes the proposed content, objective and methodology for the Phase One Modules:

PHASE ONE: INTRODUCTORY MODULES		
Content of Module	**Objective**	**Methodology**
Module 1: Introduction to Rights & Principles		
❒ **Overview of (1) human rights, (2) humanitarian law, and (3) humanitarian principles.** Their history, legal v. moral applicability, different types of rights & obligations, sources and distinguishing features.	❒ To give aid actors a working knowledge of these rights & principles, make them relevant for aid actors by demystifying them and focussing on their moral applicability to aid work.	❒ Provide a broad overview of HRL, IHL and HP mechanisms ❒ Provide examples, tests and case studies throughout asking pax to clarify distinctions, identify and apply rights norms, distinguish types of obligations, and to overview a human rights situation in a given context.
Module 2: Introduction to Rights Based Programming		
❒ **Overview of rights-based programming.** Define RBP, and show how it is different, in theory and practice from other approaches	❒ To clarify the meaning of RBP, and illustrate how it can add value to aid programming.	❒ Compare current/past programming practices to RBP approach ❒ Provide case studies for pax to use a rights approach to review a program and do a redesign.
Module 3: Incorporating Rights-Based Programming Into Assistance Work		
❒ **Applying rights-based Programming.** the development of RBP tools and methodologies.	❒ To agree on a strategy for developing RBP tools applicable to a particular context in Afghanistan.	❒ Convene aid actors working in a geographic area. ❒ Clarify the aims of RBP tools, and introduce templates for RBP tools on which to base a brain-storming strategy discussion.

Phase Two: Subject-Specific Modules

There is a wide spectrum of needs, interests and capacities across the aid community when it comes to human rights. The second phase should be tailored to cover key subjects of specific interest to organizations in greater detail.

A Training Initiative For Human Rights & Rights-Based Programming In Afghanistan:

A Report For The UN Coordinator's Office, July 1999



Under the supervision of the Human Rights Advisor
United Nations Coordinator's Office
Islamabad, Pakistan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

